## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/837,007	LIN ET AL.		
ı	Examiner	Art Unit		
	David A. Zarneke	2891		

	David A. Zarneke	2891		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 6/25/09 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following in application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION.) See MPEP 766.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,1960. The date: have been filled is the date for purposes of eletermining the period of ex- tension of the date of the date of the date of the date of the under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above; if checked, Any pely received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since a	
AMENDMENTS				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NO v);	ΓE below);		
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	er form for appeal by materially re-	auding or simplifying ti	ie issues for	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	. , ,			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).	
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>			*	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e:	planation of	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	to provide a	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:	
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (     Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
	/David A. Zarneke/			
	Primary Examiner, Art U 7/17/09	nit 2891		

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Two arguments were presented with respect to the rejection of the claims.

The first argument is that it is not obvious to use the Ti- and Ni-containing layers of Farnworth in the invention of Nozawa because Farnworth doesn't teach a cylinder surrounded by a resin.

Please note that this is a piecemeal analysis of the rejection that considers the references individually as opposed to as a combination of references. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of referencess. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Nozawa is relied upon to the act that the use of Ti- and Ni-containing layers is known in the art. The second aroument is that Nozawa doesn't require an underfill because of the polymer lawer that surrounds the cylinder.

Please note that an underfill is used to protect the bumps from damage as well as provide support, therefore an underfill would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.